## REMARKS

The claims pending in the Application after entry of the present Amendment will be claims 1-62.

## I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Takeuchi et al. (Caplus abstract of WO2001/046451; accession number 2001:472958). Specifically, the compound of Takeuchi et al. has the following structure:

Migrastatin

and corresponds to a compound of Applicants' claim 1 when:

Y<sub>1</sub> and Y<sub>2</sub> together with the carbon atom to which they are attached form a moiety having the

structure 
$$X_1 = 0$$
;  $X_1 = 0$ ;  $X_2 = 0$ ;  $X_1 = 0$ ;  $X_2 = 0$ ;  $X_3 = 0$ ;  $X_4 = 0$ ;  $X_5 = 0$ ;  $X_5 = 0$ ;  $X_5 = 0$ ;  $X_5 = 0$ ;  $X_6 = 0$ ;  $X_6 = 0$ ;  $X_7 = 0$ ;

In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend claim 1 such that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is rendered moot. Specifically, Applicants amend claim 1 such that the genus of compounds encompassed within the claimed pharmaceutical compositions cannot be migrastatin. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 25 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Takeuchi et al. be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 as amended is patentable, and allowable, thereby rendering all pending claims patentable and allowable by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

II. <u>Discussion of Election/Restriction and Claim Objections</u>

The Office Action (page 2, para. 1) indicates that claims 1-12, 14, 16-20, 27, 30 and 41-62 in

part, and claims 13, 15, 21-26, 28-29 and 31-40 in their entirety are deemed to be withdrawn.

Additionally, the Office Action (page 3) indicates that Claims 1-12, 14, 16-20, 27, 30 and 41-62 are

objected to for reading on non-elected subject matter.

Pursuant to MPEP §821.04:

"The propriety of a restriction requirement should be considered when all the claims directed to the elected invention are in condition for allowance, and

the non-elected invention(s) should be considered for rejoinder. Rejoinder involves withdrawal of a restriction requirement between an allowable

involves withdrawal of a restriction requirement between an allowable elected invention and a nonelected invention and examination of the formerly

nonelected invention on the merits."

Applicants submit that because claim 1 (i.e., the elected invention) as amended is now in

condition for allowance, all dependent claims (i.e., the non-elected invention) therefrom are also

patentable and allowable. Applicants respectfully request that the claims deemed as part of the non-

elected (i.e., claims 1-12, 14, 16-20, 27, 30 and 41-62) invention are now appropriate subject matter for

rejoinder. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that examination on the merits proceed accordingly.

To facilitate Applicant's request for examination via rejoinder, Applicants have utilized the claim

identifiers "Currently Amended", "Previously Presented" and "Original" in the section "Amendments to

the Claims", rather than using the claim identifier "Withdrawn."

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned, Julie Anne Knight, at (617) 248-5227

with any questions pertaining to the above-identified application in order to expedite prosecution of this

case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 26, 2008

/Julie Anne Knight/

Julie Anne Knight

Reg. No. 48,867

PATENT GROUP CHOATE, HALL & STEWART

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

Tel: (617) 248-5227 Fax: (617) 248-4000

jknight@choate.com

U.S.S.N. 10/551,152

Page 24 of 24

Attorney Docket No. 2003080-0205

4300139v1